ORIGINAL

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

ORIGINAL

SWIDLER BERLIN SHEREFF FRIEDMAN, LLP

THE WASHINGTON HARBOUR 3000 K STREET, NW, SUITE 300 Washington, DC 20007-5116 TELEPHONE (202) 424-7500 FACSIMILE (202) 424-7647

WWW.SWIDLAW.COM

405 LEXINGTON AVENUE New York, NY 10174

Tel.(212) 973-0111 FAX (212) 891-9598

THE CHRYSLER BUILDING

NEW YORK OFFICE

RICHARD M. RINDEFR

Pust 11 200 (424 7771) RMRINDLER(# SWIDLAW.COM

September 18, 2002

RECEIVED

VIA COURIER

Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary Federal Communications Commission The Portals 445 12th Street, S.W. Washington, D.C. 20554

SEP 1 8 2002

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Notice of Ex Parte Ruling in CC Docket No. 99-68, CC Docket No. 96-98, and Re:

WL Docket No. 02-202

Dear Ms. Dortch:

Pursuant to Section 1.120(b)(2) of the Commission Rules, this letter is to provide notice in the above-captioned proceedings of an ex parte meeting. On September 17, 2002, John Sumpter (Vice President-Regulatory of Pac-West Telecomm, Inc.) and the undersigned met with William Maher, Jeffrey Carlisle, Carol Mattey, and Jane Jackson of the Wireline Competition Bureau.

At the meeting, we discussed the structure of the Pac-West network and the negative impact on network development and deployment of the Commission's interim compensation structure for intercarrier compensation for ISP-bound traffic. As a result of that compensation structure, Pac-West exited markets it had entered shortly before the imposition of the compensation structure and did not expand into new markets. Given the anticompetitive impact of the interim compensation structure, the substantially changed circumstances in the competitive industry since the adoption of the Order and the significant reduction in the compensation level as a result of the Order, Pac-West urged that the Commission act on pending motions for reconsideration and remove the new market and growth cap provisions of its intercarrier compensation Order for ISP-bound traffic.

We also discussed the impact of the proposed revisions to security deposit policy contained in the Verizon Petition for Emergency Declaratory and Other Relief. While Pac-West's 20-year history of timely payments means that, under existing tariffs, it is not required to

No. of Copies rec'd OtList ABCDE

Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary September 18, 2002 Page 2

provide a security deposit, under proposed changes, the rating of its bonds would result in the ability of Verizon and SBC to impose deposit requirements. Such requirements result in unjustified diversion of working capital from capital-constrained competitive carriers. Existing requirements provide ILECs with adequate protection against nonpaying customers. The proposed changes are particularly inappropriate given the fact that both Verizon's and SBC's billing systems contain systemic flaws resulting in millions of dollars of charges being billed to Pac-West, which require constant monitoring of the bills and prolonged dispute resolution efforts. Moreover, Verizon's and SBC's late payment of amounts owed to Pac-West has a significantly greater impact on Pac-West than any late payment by Pac-West on them.

Pursuant to Section 1.1206(a)(i) of the Commission's Rules, an original and one copy for each docket of this letter are being submitted to the Secretary for filing in the above-referenced proceeding.

Sincerely,

Richard M. Rindler

RMR/kas

ce: William Maher

Jeffrey Carlisle Carol Mattey Jane Jackson